DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 374 PS 003 336

AUTHOR Emlen, Arthur C.
TITLE Realistic Planning for the Day Care Consumer.
INSTITUTION Oregon Univ., Portland.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 18 Mar 70
NOTE 29p.; Expanded version of paper presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare, Chicago, Illinois, June 4, 1970

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.55
DESCRIPTORS Child Care Centers, Child Development Centers, *Child Welfare, Day Care Programs, *Day Care Services, Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), *Facility Utilization Research, Family Involvement, Mother Attitudes, Negative Attitudes, *Neighborhood Centers, *Private Agencies, Program Planning, Working Parents

ABSTRACT

This paper questions public attitudes of disparagement toward child care that is privately arranged in neighborhood homes, and cites research to show that the widespread non-use of organized facilities is based on realistic alternative patterns of day care behavior. Some determinants of day care use are discussed, and an understanding of utilization behavior is seen as the key to developing quality day care of different kinds. (Author)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED043374

REALISTIC PLANNING FOR THE DAY CARE CONSUMER*

by

Arthur C. Emlen
Portland State University
School of Social Work
Portland, Oregon

March 18, 1970

*Expanded version of paper prepared for presentation to the National Conference on Social Welfare, Chicago, June 4, 1970, as part of a special session, Realistic Family Day Care for the Urban Day Care Consumer, sponsored by the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers.

PS003336

Field Study of the Neighborhood Family Day Care System
A Research Project of the Tri-County Community Council in cooperation with Portland State University

Arthur C. Emlen, Ph.D.
Project Director

Supported by U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Child Welfare Research Grant #R-287

REALISTIC PLANNING FOR THE DAY CARE CONSUMER

In the rhetoric used to support an increasing national enthusiasm for day care facilities and child development programs there is a strong element of public disparagement of child care that is privately arranged.[1] The working mother's use of "unsupervised" neighborhood homes has been singled out as an especially questionable form of day care,[2] and the prevalence of these informal arrangements is presumed to offer an index of need for organized day care facilities.[3] How valid is this reasoning? How well confirmed are the assumptions involved? Does the evidence support the assumption that private arrangements provide an unsatisfactory quality of care? And, of more practical significance, is it reasonable to assume that the users of neighborhood day care would respond to alternative forms of day care if they were available?

This paper takes issue with these assumptions and argues that the widespread non-use of organized facilities is rooted in understandable patterns of day care behavior. The apparent recalcitrance of the day care consumer, when examined closely, is found to be a realistic choice among alternative child care arrangements. Each arrangement may be seen as a unique solution for a complicated equation of family life in which beliefs and aspirations are balanced by social experience and the force of circumstances.

Professional perspectives on day care tend to emphasize the welfare and development of the child, and this emphasis has been intensified by the burgeoning interest in child development programs. It is difficult to criticize official thinking about day care programs for being child-oriented; day care must indeed be evaluated in terms of its benefits to the child. Yet this paper calls attention to the conditions under which day care resources will be used -- either used to the child's advantage or even used

at all. The lessons of Head Start research already point to the importance of parental behavior and family differences as mediators of the child's success in child development programs.[4] And in his freedom to make supplemental child care arrangements of his own choosing, the day care consumer has proved remarkably resistant to the efforts of agencies to recommend the care "of choice" for its clients. Therefore, unless the nation is going to pursue coercive policies and practices and attempt to dictate the choice of the day care consumer, it behooves child welfare spokesmen to be less exclusively preoccupied with what they themselves think is important about child care and to pay serious attention to how day care arrangements are evaluated by the users. The thesis of this paper is that realistic planning for the day care consumer calls for a pluralistic approach based on sympathetic inquiry into why people make the arrangements that they do and how they go about it.

The most salient fact about the child care arrangements of working mothers is that a wide variety of relatives and non-relatives are being pressed into child care service across the country, but that only a small percentage of the children are served by organized day care facilities. For full-time working mothers, a 1965 national census[5] found 72% of the children under six years of age cared for either at home or by kin. Eight percent were in group day care facilities, either public, voluntary, or commercial, while 20% were in out-of-home arrangements with non-relatives. As a result of the new programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and other efforts to provide high quality day care for children, new groups of children have been reached, but the fact must be faced that probably 90% of the children of working mothers remain untouched by organized day care programs.

Whether from preference or from necessity, when families turn outside

the home and beyond kinship resources, they are most likely to make arrangements for their children in the home of a friend, neighbor, babysitter, or other non-relative. Almost all of these "family day care" arrangements are unlicensed,[6] and they are contracted privately and informally at the neighborhood level without benefit of social agency. According to conservative official estimates, over half a million children under six are in private family day care arrangements at any given time.[7]

Evaluating Neighborhood Family Day Care

How, then, should neighborhood day care be viewed? Is this a casual and inherently unstable form of economic and social arrangement that results in neglect and chaotic discontinuity of care for hundreds of thousands of children? Or is this a creative, emerging cultural pattern of child care in which a familiar and nurturant care-giving neighbor provides an "extended family" -- kith, though not kin -- that has potential for enriching the lives of hundreds of thousands of children?

The official bias is that these arrangements are of doubtful quality along with all child care that is not supervised by an agency or provided by a day care center. In the jargon of the child welfare field, these are "unsupervised" arrangements, and they are unacceptable for that reason. In the rhetoric of educators, social workers, and perhaps the public sector generally, these arrangements are "custodial" in nature and lacking in educational merit or developmental enrichment. "Mere babysitting" is a frequently heard slur, and even a wholesale charge of "neglect" is made. The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, in a recent "Fact Sheet"[8] lamented the situation of ten and a half million children under 12 simply because they were not in a day care center, featuring this fact under the headline, "NEGLECT". Others are apt to use the same figures as evidence of the need for day care facilities.[9]

"Neglect," "mere babysitting" -- this rhetoric which stereotypes the child care arrangements of a vast group of families is used to promote a "party line" in day care programming. Perhaps the disparaging language reflects widespread anxiety about the quality of child care or uncertainty about how to evaluate it, and perhaps the concept is an effort to make a distinction between minimal custodial care and the care that nurtures, stimulates and enriches a child's life. With astonishing lack of logic, however, the worst of private family day care is thus contrasted with the best of group care in a child development center.

Available research findings do not support any wholesale charge of neglect against private family day care. Although dramatic instances of neglect and substandard care can be cited[10], family day care is a solution that for the majority of children involved probably creates only subtle deprivations mixed with subtle enrichments. Since most maternal employment requires the use of supplemental child care resources, one might suppose that available research on the effects of maternal employment on children would provide evidence concerning the effects of different types of day care. So far, however, studies of the effects of maternal employment have failed to take into account the various types of day care arrangements made for the child, and maternal employment status per se has not been found directly associated with adverse effects on children.[11] It is important to bear in mind that many of the important factors determining outcomes for the child arise not from the form of supplemental child care but from characteristics of the child, parental behaviors, and from conditions of family life. It is reasonable to be concerned about the effects of extreme discontinuity and insufficiency of care, and one might speculate about some of the more subtle possible effects of child-rearing that is shared with a sitter, but the impact of different types of private family day care as special kinds of child-rearing environments have

yet to be reported.

Although research is lacking that directly assesses the effects on children, nevertheless, some research is available describing the attributes of neighborhood day care. The working mothers themselves, for example, for the most part have reported family day care to be a moderately satisfactory solution despite the strains inherent in it. Generally favorable global impressions of sitters by working mothers were reported by Perry[12] in a Spokane study, and the 1965 special census found only approximately 10% of the family day care children in at least "somewhat unsatisfactory" arrangements, according to the mothers' reports.[13] In a probability sample of urban families, however, Ruderman found that 31% of family day care users reported a moderate or higher level of dissatisfaction with their arrangements, and described some of the strains involved in this form of care.[14] In a New York sample that was less representative but more intensively studied, Willner found reason to be concerned about substandard housing conditions but not about the caretakers themselves as persons whom he described generally as "qualified", "warm", and "mature, responsible women."[15]

The women who use or provide private family day care have proven somewhat resistant to survey research, with the result that samples are apt to be biased toward the more successful and presentable examples of family day care.[16] A research project in Portland, Oregon known as the Field Study of the Neighborhood Family Day Care System,[17] has made an effort to study as wide a range as possible in the working mother's use of neighborhood babysitters for the child under six. The Field Study used informal social networks at the neighborhood level to locate sample for longitudinal studies of family day care arrangements.[18] From this neighborhood vantage point one is impressed initially with the amount of turnover in arrangements and with the difficulty of making stable arrangements. In view of the instability of many arrange-

PS 003336

ments, questions regarding the insufficiency of care in any given arrangement are matched in importance by the problem of discontinuity of care. There are mothers who make one unsatisfactory arrangement after another, exposing their children to chaotic, discontinuous care. On the other hand, there are mothers who have managed to find and to maintain stable family day care arrangements that last many years.

One's perspective on the stability of family day care arrangements is determined very much by the kind of sample one is able to observe. The Field Study has included several independent samples, each of which is somewhat different in its sampling characteristics but which together suggest what kind of stability may be expected for family day care arrangements. The duration data for these samples are shown in Table 1 in order of increasing duration. The samples of terminated day care arrangements, known through the unofficial neighborhood network of the project's Day Care Neighbor Service, have been uniformly of short duration -- a median duration of somewhat less than two months -- while a sample of current family day care arrangements made by working mothers for their children under six had a median duration of six months at the time of interview, and a subsequent followup revealed that 53% were lasting one year or longer.

Table 1 here.

It is to be expected, of course, that samples of either new or terminated arrangements will show short durations because such samples draw heavily from those whose patterns of day care are characterized by turnover. On the other hand, it is also to be expected that samples of continuing arrangements, that is, arrangements that are sampled while they are still current and viable, are more likely to include the stable longer lasting arrangements. Although

Table 1

Median Durations of Independent Samples of Neighborhood Family Day Care Arrangements

	Sample Characteristics	Median Duration
367	terminated arrangements known about through Day Care Neighbor Service, 3/1/68 - 2/28/69.	1 - 2 months
35	terminated arrangements of working mothers receiving supplementary ADC assistance, interviewed spring, 1966.	2 months
180	new arrangements (panel study) located through classified ads, neighborhood contacts, employment, 1968-70.	3 months
22	continuing arrangements from neighborhood survey, resurveyed 1 year later, 1965.	6 months
146	continuing arrangements of working mothers located through employment, 1967-68.	
	at the time of interview	6 months
	at the time of followup	1 year

it cannot be assumed that a short arrangement is necessarily a problem for the mother or bad for the child, there was sufficient evidence of difficulty both in making and maintaining family day care arrangements to warrant attention to the problem of stability. Findings from this project, which will be reported in subsequent papers, throw light on the sources of stability or instability for the often quite different types of family day care that may be found. The duration data point up the fact that day care outcomes are not simply characteristics of the day care resource but are dependent upon the conditions and contingencies of use.

Alternatives to Neighborhood Family Day Care

It is fruitful to shift one's attention from issues of quality of care to utilization issues -- to questions about the conditions under which programs or care resources will be used by the day care consumer. Even when there is reason to be concerned at least about some proportion of the family day care arrangements that are made in the private sector of society, the question still remains as to what approaches offer some likelihood of being effective in tackling the problem. Society's answer to unsupervised arrangements has been either to attempt to set standards for the regulation of proprietary efforts through day care licensing programs[19] or to compete with the private, informal care resources through direct provision of day care of high quality in an agency program, either in day care centers or in supervised family day care homes.[20] Both of these approaches, however, have serious limitations.

Even the licensing approach has failed to make a significant impact on either the users or givers of private family day care. In Oakland, California, for example, Kuderman found only 250 formal agency approved family day care

homes but an estimated population of several thousand women giving family day care on an informal, unlicensed basis.[21] The probability sample of Oakland mothers revealed that the "informal child care industry" accounted for at least 10% of the women's occupations -- twice the number doing domestic work. None of these were licensed homes, however, in a state where there is a licensing law that calls for the regulation of all out-of-home care by non-relatives. A similar pattern was found in six urbanized areas and in one rural county surveyed in the Ruderman study. One must conclude, it seems, that the private world of family day care probably is destined to remain untouched by agency programs unless radically new ways are found to reach beyond the traditional boundaries of agency influence.

The prevailing agency approach to day care has already received extended historical[22] and sociological[23] critique. It is small wonder that agency family day care programs have remained small in scope, considering the elaborate formal requirements of professionally supervised family day care. According to the traditional approach, family day care is presented to the community as a social agency service based on a diagnostic assessment of a family problem in which the agency makes a decision about whether day care is an appropriate alternative.[24] Day care, then, becomes a planned "placement" as a type of "foster care" in which the agency plays a major role in selection and supervision of the placement. This model requires the potential user of day care to call or present himself to a social agency and to accept its services. The agency for its part must recruit not only the user of the service but also the givers of care to become certified and supervised "foster day care mothers."

Why have agency family day care programs failed to attract the vast majority of potential users? Ruderman[25] and Mayer[26] have pointed to the problem-oriented character of the services offered as unattractive, to the

general consumer. But there is another reason which is perhaps more fundamental. There is really no compelling basis for believing that the tasks of finding, selecting,and making child care arrangements can be performed better by experts than by the individual parties to an arrangement.[27] Quite the contrary, the selection process is too subjective, subtle, and complex to be substituted for by the rational decision-making of another person -- especially since no body of knowledge exists on which an expert could base his match-making decision. In view of the magnitude of unsupervised day care activity, all that a large scale family day care service probably should expect to accomplish is indirectly to influence the natural processes by which families go about making their child care arrangements.

Perhaps the most popular official answer to unsupervised child care arrangements is the development of the group care facility -- the day care center. It is widely assumed that if only there were more day care facilities, day care needs would be met. What this assumption ignores, however, are the many powerful constraints on use of day care facilities.

Even where waiting lists show evidence of day care need, group care facilities have suffered from a curious symptom -- that of underenrollment. Ruderman found that organized day care facilities across the country tend to be underenrolled. In Oakland 71% of the day care centers were underenrolled but "underenrollment dominates the picture everywhere."[28] Nursery schools and family day care homes also reported underenrollment.

Why is there under-use of organized facilities despite evidence of unmet need and unmet requests for care? According to Ruderman,

> The answer . . . lies in a lack of congruence between existing programs and existing needs. This involves problems of location and transportation; lack of public knowledge of existing facilities; a welter of restrictions, requirements and priorities; and frequent poor quality. But perhaps the most basic

> cause is the absence of a comprehensive philosophy of supplementary child care service, within which day care could be developed as a good and attractive form of supplementary child care, rather than as either a social work service to troubled families, or a commercialized form of custodial care. Day care at present is largely unrelated to the actual total needs for supplementary child care in the community.[29]

Of course, the character of organized day care may be changing. Although the quality ratings from two studies[30] of day care centers are not uniformly favorable, it is likely that significant improvements in the adequacy of group-care programs will be seen in the future, when they are coupled with more flexible and comprehensive efforts to provide day care and related services to the community. A number of recent studies suggest that group day care may have enrichment possibilities even for the very young child.[31] Nevertheless, even with the improvements in care made possible by the new federal programs, it is still unlikely that organized facilities will attract more than a limited proportion of day care consumers. The reasons have to do with inevitable problems of utilization.

Some Determinants of Day Care Use

Why make such a pessimistic prediction? It is because the crucial issue is not so much whether or not the day care resource offers high quality of care but what, in addition, are the other conditions that determine the use of day care resources. In spite of sophisticated thinking about standards for day care, the field is just beginning to do its elementary homework on the problem of utilization. Little attention has been given, for example, to the way in which day care users perceive the benefits to the child or to themselves and how these benefits balance with the realistic requirements of families for child care arrangements that are conveniently located, flexible in hours, responsive to emergencies, dependable, and reasonable in cost. Equally compelling requirements for the day care user may be social experience

and basic sources of preference for arrangements that are congenial in values, socially approachable, comfortably familiar, and manageable in the contractual and personal relationships involved.

The utilization issue is illustrated by the experience of Operation Alphabet, a project in Philadelphia which found creative solutions to the day care problems of AFDC families.

> We were assuming that AFDC mothers would welcome the opportunity to place their children in approved day care centers. As a few vacancies opened up mothers were referred to them. Most of the referrals didn't take.[32]

The project became successful when it adapted flexibly to the life styles of the families themselves, accepting their expressed preference for neighbors and friends as their child care resources.[33]

It should be recognized that the factors determining non-use of organized facilities involve far more than the age limitations for group care or other constraints imposed by the facility itself as a matter of policy. Although utilization factors are many, complex, and interrelated, it will suffice to discuss the significance of only three: family size, physical distance from home to the day care resource, and stated preference for type of care.

Perhaps the most important constraint upon the ability of a family to use a group care facility is family size -- the number of children in the family who could need this type of arrangement. But it is important to recognize that the same is true for neighborhood sitters and for relatives used for out-of-home arrangements. Ruderman found only one child per arrangement in 75% of day care center usage and in 70% of care by neighborhood sitters.[34] In screening 494 working mothers for one of the samples of the Field Study in Portland, Oregon, families with two or more children in an arrangement were less likely to have made an out-of-home arrangement by a

thirty-two percentage difference. See Table 2. Census data reported by Low and Spindler also show care in own home to be associated with family size.[35] This relationship probably can be explained most readily on the basis of the relative cost and inconvenience of making arrangements for out-of-home care for increasing numbers of children. Larger families also have more "built-in" child care resources at home.

Table 2 here.

How great is the physical distance from home that a working mother can manage conveniently? The Ruderman data show that a third of center users live less than five minutes away, while 70% of family day care users are within five minutes of the day care home.[36] Though a center may take pride in the distance people will travel for the benefits of its program, Ruderman reports that distance is associated with dissatisfaction with the arrangement.[37]

Perhaps institutional programs assume too much plasticity in human willingness to do what is inconvenient or unfamiliar. Just as one might study the habitat selection of birds,[38] one can observe how far people tend to go in making neighborhood day care arrangements. There is value simply in recognizing that although working mothers will go considerable distances for a desirable sitter, most neighborhood sitters are indeed found close to home. Table 3 shows that for 85% of a sample of relatively stable, current family day care arrangements the distance between the home of the working mother and the home of her sitter was within two miles. More interesting, however, is that 17% of the arrangements were next door or across the street, and, measuring distance not as the crow flies but as one walks around a city block, one must keep doubling the distance in order to find the same increment in number of arrangements. Only when working mothers were traveling more than

Table 2

Type of Current Child Care Arrangement
by Number of Children in Arrangement

Type of Arrangement	Number of Children	
	1	2 or more
Out of home*	77%	45%
In home and combination**	23%	55%
	100%	100%
	N = 230	N = 264

* Includes relatives, family day care, and day care centers.

** Includes husband, sibling, other relatives, sitters in, and combinations.

2 miles did they tend to agree with the statement, "My sitter lives too far away to be convenient."

Table 3 here.

The proximity of actual family day care arrangements represents an underestimate of the potentially available neighborhood day care resources, since a working mother may live three doors down from a potential sitter without knowing it or feeling comfortable about approaching her without some third-party acting as an intermediary. That such third parties perform a match-making role became a basis for the establishment of the Day Care Neighbor Service which will be discussed below.

One of the first questions that is asked about the users of family day care is whether or not they prefer it as an alternative form of supplemental child care. It is assumed that people would use day care centers if they were conveniently located. In the preference data reported by Ruderman, 44% of the whites and 82% of the Negroes who had out-of-home arrangements with a neighbor, friend or babysitter, stated that they probably would use a day care center if there were such a place near by.[39] Willner's study of Family Day Care Users in New York City in a sample predominantly Puerto Rican and Negro found results similar to Ruderman's for the Negro population. Willner reported that family day care was a second choice of care for four-fifths of the mothers interviewed,with group care as the first choice.[40]

A Portland sample of working mothers who were white and largely middle-class[41] showed a pattern of preferences quite different from the Willner sample and similar but more extreme than the white sample from the Ruderman study. Seventy-two percent of the Portland women using family day care reported preference for family day care over group care in response to the item,

Table 3

Distance to the Sitter's Home for Current Family Day Care Arrangements of Working Mothers

Distance	Cumulative Percent
Next door or across the street	17
Within 1 or 2 blocks	32
Within 1/4 mile	44
Within 1/2 mile	60
Within 1 mile	72
Within 2 miles	85
Within 4 miles	95
Within 8 miles	97

N = 104 arrangements

"I would rather have my child at the home of a sitter than at a day care center."[42]

The women of this sample were located through places of employment, and the sample represents a relatively stable group of working mothers who succeeded in making relatively stable family day care arrangements. For example, 65% had lived at the same address a year or more, 75% had been working mothers a year or more, and 66% had been on the same job a year or more. It should be pointed out, though, that job continuity was not matched by continuity of the child care arrangement. Of the 110 mothers who had worked a year or more, 84% had been obliged to find at least one additional child care arrangement during this time. The median number of their previous arrangements was two. Nevertheless, 53% of the sampled arrangements lasted at least a year. The sample did represent a relatively stable group of family day care arrangements, most of which were perceived by the mothers and sitters as satisfactory on a number of dimensions.

Although the preference data reported above are based on family day care arrangements for children under six years of age, it is clear that only the older children in this sample would be eligible for group care facilities. Thus, one might ask whether the preference would hold up for children of group care age in contrast to infants and toddlers. Table 4 shows the preferences reported by mothers who had only one child in the family day care arrangement. The preference for family day care over group care increases slightly for mothers with children of group care age. It seems reasonable to interpret this data as attributable to sample loss in the older group; that is, if a mother preferred group care, then she might well have placed her child in group care and would not have shown up in the sample of family day care users. This evidence is consistent with the view that, while some

family day care users are recruitable to group care, there also exists a residual group of family day care users who actually prefer the kind of arrangement that they made.

Table 4 here.

Utilization Behavior as the Key to Quality of Care

A stated preference is a comparative judgment that by itself tells us little about the strength or plasticity of the preference, nor does it tell us what the preference is based on.[43] The approach of the Field Study is to explore in considerable detail the working mother's own evaluation of her arrangement, as well as the sitter's evaluation of the same arrangement. What are the important sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the arrangement for both parties in relation to their own values and expectations? The next and more important issue then becomes one of identifying the conditions under which the working mother will make an arrangement that is satisfactory to her, that is satisfactory to her sitter, and to the child, and that will endure if they want it to.

In view of the relatively inconsequential impact of licensing programs on family day care, it is important to face squarely the question of whether, or to what extent, society can rely upon the evaluations and efforts of the privately contracting parties to the family day care arrangement. A complex set of issues is involved in their evaluations of their arrangements and a complex set of objective circumstances is involved in influencing their day care attitudes and behavior. Nevertheless, the evidence so far supports the conclusion that working mothers do form lively evaluative impressions of their neighborhood sitters and of the effects of the arrangement on their

Table 4

Preference for Family Day Care over Day Care Center by Age of Child for Working Mothers with One Child in a Family Day Care Arrangement (Percentages)

Prefers Family Day Care to Day Care Center	Age of Child	
	Under 4	4 or 5
Yes	68%	79%
No	32%	21%
	100%	100%
	N = 73	N = 34

children.[44] However, it is also evident that some of these same mothers are pressed to act contrary to their own evaluations under force of economic circumstances and other pressures.

What is advocated is a shift in attitude and approach. Traditional, official models of day care planning have relied heavily on the assumption that quality of care is primarily a characteristic of the care resource -- of the person who gives care, of the setting in which care is provided, and of the program itself. This paper emphasizes the role of the day care user, and argues for the development of a model in which quality of care is seen as a product of a system of behaviors between the users and providers of child care. By identifying the determinants of use of different types of day care, then one can direct one's attention along preventive lines toward the development of policies and practices that could change the rates at which working mothers make unsatisfactory child care arrangements.

The Field Study, for example, includes one such approach called the Day Care Neighbor Service, in which intervention is accomplished indirectly at the neighborhood level. Families are reached by providing consultation to a network of Day Care Neighbors who in turn help potential users and givers of family day care to find each other and to make mutually satisfactory arrangements. Through the communication channels of this network the aim is to influence in modest ways the quality and continuity of care that is offered in private day care arrangements.[45]

Multiple approaches are needed, including the development of accessible group care facilities and child development programs that are responsive to the realistic needs of families. In addition to programs for out-of-home care, high priority should be given to devising attractive and economically feasible ways of cultivating the potentials of the sitter who comes into the

home. In sum, we need a pluralistic approach that seeks to understand the varied needs of the day care consumer and that pursues child development objectives within a context of programs designed to strengthen the contributions of supplemental child care to family life.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Examples of this attitude may be found almost daily in newspaper accounts of speeches made in behalf of day care by official sources. See also documents such as the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements as approved by the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity, and U. S. Department of Labor, September 23, 1968, as well as the recent material of the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., e.g., Voice for Children and the Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) Handbook.

[2] Judith Cauman, "Family Day Care and Group Day Care: Two Essential Aspects of a Basic Child Welfare Service," Child Welfare, XL (October, 1961), 2-23. Milton Willner has discussed such attitudes in "Day Care: A Reassessment," Child Welfare, XLIV (March, 1965), 125-133. See also data on attitudes toward this form of child care in Florence A. Ruderman, Child Care and Working Mothers: A Study of Arrangements Made for Daytime Care of Children (New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1968), pp. 62-63.

[3] Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc. "Fact Sheet" (1969); Beatrice Rosenberg and Pearl G. Spindler, "Facts About Day Care," Women's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor (Washington, D.C.: October, 1969); Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago, Division of Planning and Research, Day Care of Children in Chicago: Needs and Resources, by Community Areas, (Publication No. 1025, 1967), p. 19.

[4] Edith H. Grotberg (ed.), Critical Issues in Research Related to Disadvantaged Children, (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1969); Christoph M. Heinicke, et al., "Parent-Child Relationships, Adaptation to Nursery School, and Mastery of Cognitive Tasks: A Contrast in Development." (Los Angeles: manuscript, 1969).

[5] Seth Low and Pearl G. Spindler, Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States, Children's Bureau Publication No. 461-1968 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 71.

[6] Rosenberg and Spindler, op.cit., p. 1.

[7] Low and Spindler, op.cit., p. 71.

[8] Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc. op.cit.

[9] The conceptual problem of defining "need" is ignored in most accounts by simply reporting numbers of working mothers and their child care arrangements. See Mary Dublin Keyserling, Working Mothers and the Need for Child Care Services, Women's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968); also Low and Spindler, op.cit.; Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago, op.cit. For a more careful attempt to define "need" and to compare the empirical results of using different operational definitions, see Jack Wiener, Survey Methods for Determining the Need for Services to Children of Working Mothers, Children's Bureau, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956). A definition of day care need as "normal" is given by Florence A. Ruderman, "Conceptualizing Needs for Day Care," Child Welfare, XLIV (April, 1965), 207-213.

[10] Willner, op.cit., 125; Sid Ross, "Who Takes care of Your Children?" Parade Magazine, (March 5, 1967), 18-21; Elizabeth Herzog, Children of Working Mothers, Children's Bureau Publication No. 382-1960 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960), pp. 12-16.

[11] For example, the apparent association between juvenile delinquency and maternal employment found by the Gluecks, largely disappears when controlled for the adequacy of supervision; see Travis Hirschi and Hanan C. Selvin, Delinquency

Research: An Appraisal of Analytic Methods, (New York: Free Press, 1967), pp. 237-242. A number of reviews of this literature are available; see Herzog, ibid., pp. 16-31; Lois M. Stolz, "Effects of Maternal Employment on Children: Evidence of Research," Child Development, 37 (1960), 749-782; F. Ivan Nye and Lois Wladis Hoffman, The Employed Mother in America, (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963). For a recent broad review of deprivation research, see Perspectives on Human Deprivation: Biological, Psychological, and Sociological, (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1968).

[12] Joseph B. Perry, "The Mother Subsitutes of Employed Mothers: An Exploratory Inquiry," Marriage and Family Living, XXIII (November, 1961), 362-367.

[13] Low and Spindler, op.cit., pp. 25, 110.

[14] Ruderman, op.cit., p. 242.

[15] Milton Willner, "Unsupervised Family Day Care in New York City," Child Welfare, XLVIII (June, 1969), 342-347.

[16] Willner, ibid., 342.

[17] A research project of the Tri-County Community Council and Portland State University, supported by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Children's Bureau Grant #R-287. The Field Study also includes a service component called the Day Care Neighbor Service. This service, directed by Alice H. Collins, ACSW, has been described in the literature in Alice H. Collins, Arthur C. Emlen, Eunice L. Watson, "The Day Care Neighbor Service: An Interventive Experiment," Community Mental Health Journal, 5 (June, 1969), 219-224; Alice H. Collins and Eunice L. Watson, "Exploring the Neighborhood Family Day Care System," Social Casework, (November, 1969) 527-533; and Alice H. Collins and Eunice L. Watson, The Day Care Neighbor Service: A Hand-

book for the Organization and Operation of a New Approach to Family Day Care, (Portland: Tri-County Community Council, 1969).

[18] Since the project's Day Care Neighbors knew when arrangements were being made in their particular localities, the communication network of the Day Care Neighbor Service supplied a source of sample for the research in which the social interaction between mothers and sitters could be studied.

[19] For a discussion of approaches, issues, and further references, see Lela B. Costin (ed.), Proceedings of the Centennial Conference on the Regulation of Child-Care Facilities, (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1968).

[20] Child Welfare League Standards for Day Care Service, (New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1960, Revised 1969). For an overview of agency care services see Alfred Kadushin, Child Welfare Service, (New York: Macmillan, 1967), pp. 300-353.

[21] Ruderman, op.cit., p.88.

[22] Anna B. Mayer, Day Care as a Social Instrument: A Policy Paper,(New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1965).

[23] Ruderman, op.cit.

[24] Bessie E. Trout and Dorothy E. Bradbury, Mothers for a Day: The Care of Children in Families Other Than Their Own, Children's Bureau Publication No. 318-1946 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1946). A recent statement of this approach is the Standards promoted by the Child Welfare League of America, op.cit., p. 18 and pp. 44-52.

[25] Ruderman, op.cit., pp. 338-358.

[26] Mayer, op.cit., pp. 75-78.

[27] For a discussion of the conditions under which experts are of little use, see Eugene Litwak, "Towards a Balance Theory of 'Grass Roots' Community Organization." (Ann Arbor, mimeograph, 1967).

[28] Ruderman, op.cit., p. 95.

[29] Ruderman, ibid., p. 96.

[30] Ruderman, ibid., pp. 109-115; Elizabeth Prescott and Elizabeth Jones with Sybil Kritchevsky, Day Care as a Child Rearing Environment: An Observational Study of Day Care Program, (Pasadena: Pacific Oaks College, 1967).

[31] On Rearing infants and Young Children in Institutions, Children's Bureau Research Reports No. 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967); Laura L. Dittman (ed.), Early Child Care: The New Perspectives, (New York: Atherton, 1968).

[32] Audrey Pittman, "Operation Alphabet -- The Enabler," Public Welfare (January, 1969), p. 23.

[33] Pittman, ibid., pp. 23, 24.

[34] Ruderman, op.cit., pp. 284, 291.

[35] Low and Spindler, op.cit., pp. 83, 19.

[36] Ruderman, op.cit., pp. 285, 291

[37] Ruderman, ibid., p. 285.

[38] P. H. Klopfer and J. P. Hailman, "Habitat Selection in Birds," in Advances in the Study of Behavior, edited by Daniel S. Lehrman, Robert A. Hinde, and Evelyn Shaw, (New York: Academic Press, 1965), pp. 279-303.

[39] Ruderman, op.cit., pp. 306, 330.

[40] Willner, 1969, op.cit., p. 346.

[41] Seventy-four percent of the Reiss Scale SES ratings for the occupations of the working mothers and their husbands fell between 34 and 65, mostly clerical and sales categories.

[42] Most respondents at least slightly agreed with this statement, with a mean score of +1.23 and a standard deviation of 1.78 on a 7 point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Parallel results were obtained by asking respondents to rank six alternative types of child care arrangements presented to them on a card. This more complicated choice, which included the alternative of staying at home, also gave a relative ranking of family day care over a day care center, correlating .61 with the paired-comparison item. For an analysis of this preference data, see "Patterns of Day Care Preferences of Family Day Care Users." (In process, for publication in Child Welfare.)

[43] Such stated preferences are also subject to response biases. Respondents may present their arrangement in a favorable light or compare it unfavorably with an imagined alternative, or they may simply try to oblige the interviewer. It is hard to know how much confidence to have in reported preferences, but they give at least some clue to attitudes toward the alternatives perceived.

[44] Arthur C. Emlen, Progress Report No. 4, Appendix I, (July, 1969). A detailed report of these evaluations is in preparation. Of special interest are the first rotated factors for both mothers and sitters: mother's satisfaction with sitter's concern for child and sitter's satisfaction with mother's concern for her child.

[45] This service has been described elsewhere, op.cit. For two examples in the effort of others, see Pittman, op.cit., and Daniel B. Scheinfeld, "On Developing Developmental Families," (a paper presented at the Head Start Research Seminar #5 on Intervention in Family Life), in Edith H. Grotberg (ed.) Critical Issues in Research Related to Disadvantaged Children, (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1969). (Available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 4936 Fairmont Ave., Bethesda, Maryland 20014; ED 034 088, MF-$2.00; HC-$26.10, 520p.)